

Affidavit

State of California)
) ss
County of San Mateo)

I, William Henshall, a lawful de jure *jus sanguinis* free white California Citizen (*Article IV, Section 2 of the Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} and/or Article II, Section 1 of the California Constitution (1849)*), being first duly subscribed and sworn, declare, *under penalty of perjury*, the following facts, *which are true of my own personal knowledge*, to wit:

1. That the following list of cases are ones in which Affiant was a party and/or in which Affiant was intimately involved at the request of a party by reason of an Agreement for Services executed pursuant to our *unlimited* power to contract as secured by *Article I, Section 10* of the *Constitution for the united States {1787-1791}*:
2. “state of South Carolina” v Henshall, *Case No. 2015A4010300032* in the Richland County circuit “court”, in which Affiant was falsely arrested, extradited and imprisoned for *7 MONTHS* as a *political* prisoner, having suffered *multiple pre-meditated criminal acts* by agents of the *de facto* S.C. government, many of which occurred *BEFORE* the ink was dry on the charging documents, yet your Affiant blew out the entirety of the legal apparatus of S.C. literally all the way to the ‘statehouse’, while *alone in a jail cell*, often locked down 18+ hours a day, and with no *known* ‘right’ to (*effective* ?) assistance of counsel !
3. *Henshall v New South Parking - Case Nos. CIV 465862, CIV 475205, CIV 485551*, filed attempting to challenge hegemony of ‘Congress’ Interstate Commerce clause powers, but all three cases summarily removed to federal district “court” on thin boilerplate pleadings, *NO* opposition to merits; all cases dismissed (12(b)(6)), and Affiant ‘found’, in *ex parte* fashion, by “judge” Susan Illston, to be a “vexatious litigant” in a “court” in which he *never* filed any case and into which *he could not then, and cannot now, even gain entry*; (your Affiant did later to ‘gain entry’ to the federal building, albeit being *manacled hand & foot* ‘courtesy’ of the S.C. arrest !)

4. ***“People” v Henshall Case No. ??*** -- San Mateo County Court, South San Francisco, Ca. (5-29-2002) -- ***CVC 14601*** charge dropped ex parte one day before “trial”; Affiant appeared at “trial” with 3 sets of **225** jury instructions (now **572**), but was “convicted”, in a bench “trial” of infractions -- including **16028 CVC**; attempted to pay the fine in gold & silver coin, but refused on the record by clerk of court; ensuing **certified** mail demand to San Mateo DA James Fox to prosecute Affiant for a **“willful failure to pay”** (Section 40508 CALIFORNIA Vehicle Code) was not even acknowledged, let alone accepted, **now 20 years later**;
5. ***Henshall v Bank of America Case No. 683711*** in the Stanislaus County Court -- summary dismissal on April 17th, 2013, concededly **NO** opposition filed, **NO** appearance by BoA, alleged ground for dismissal, **without notice**, was “ineffective service of process” though **ALL** protocols for service scrupulously followed, with **NO** mention of reason for “ineffectiveness” and with record set that CALIFORNIA is **NOT** a State, but a territory (transcript available upon request);
6. ***US Bank National Association v Spack Case No. 2011-989*** in the Jefferson County, Idaho District Court -- **NO** appearance by USBNA, **NO** opposition to pleadings by Bank, multiple clear and unambiguous violations of purportedly applicable Idaho Rules of Court, denial of Service Agreement between Defendant and Petitioner herein, and their **unlimited** power to contract (**Article I, Section 10**), summary denial of **UNOPPOSED** Motion to Vacate Void Judgment, and like results in Idaho Supreme Court, **Case No. 40111** with summary dismissal of Appeal on BS procedural grounds, with renewed Motion to Vacate Void Judgment pending in the ISC;
7. ***“People” v LAR Case No. F101591B*** in the Alameda County Superior Court -- summary denial of Service Agreement, as hereinabove mentioned, **NO** response by DA to timely filed Demand for Bill of Particulars, refusal by clerk to file Writ of Habeas Corpus, refusal to file, and/or mis-filing of timely Motion to Quash Service of Process, Section 418.10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, **NO** injured party, **NO** accuser to confront & cross examine, **NO** jury trial, **NO** assistance of counsel, **NO** appeal, **NO** Writ of Habeas Corpus;
8. ***“People” v Cruz Citation No. 45810 PL*** in the Alameda County Superior Court -- summary denial of Service Agreement, as hereinabove mentioned, **NO** response by DA to timely filed Demand for Bill of Particulars, **NO**

arraignment, refusal by clerk of court to file Writ of Habeas Corpus, refusal to file, and/or mis-filing of timely Motion to Quash Service of Process, Section 418.10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, **NO** injured party, **NO** accuser to confront & cross examine, **NO** jury trial, **NO** assistance of counsel, **NO** appeal, **NO** Writ of Habeas Corpus;

9. ***HAWAII v Thompson Case No. 3DTI-13-092509*** in the Hawaii District Court Third Circuit -- summary denial of Service Agreement, as hereinabove mentioned, **NO** response by DA to timely filed Demand for Bill of Particulars, refusal to file Writ of Habeas Corpus, refusal to file, and/or mis-filing of timely Motion to Quash Service of Process, Section 418.10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, **NO** injured party, **NO** accuser to confront & cross examine, **NO** jury trial, **NO** assistance of counsel, **NO** appeal, **NO** Writ of Habeas Corpus;
10. ***Moore-Weeks v Stanford Univ. Case No. 502156*** in the Santa Clara County Superior Court -- wrongful termination case summarily dismissed, effectively ***without*** opposition by Stanford Univ. and with Plaintiff having prevailed, with the assistance of your Affiant, ***across the board*** in arbitration proceedings pursuant to her wrongful termination thereby establishing claim; convoluted, bloated, ***procedure*** driven appeal also summarily dismissed on poppycock, pretended procedural grounds;
11. ***LRP v HMS Host/Here Local # 2 Case No. CGC07-469683*** in the San Francisco County Court - wrongful termination proceedings summarily removed to federal district "court" on boilerplate pleadings and ***WITHOUT*** any opposition to merits of case, one in which Defendants ***STIPULATED*** to the wrongful termination of Plaintiff by unilaterally cancelling an arbitration which they ***KNEW*** that they were going to lose; Affiant and Plaintiff's Service Agreement, pursuant to ***Article I, Section 10*** also summarily denied, and made worse by the fact that Affiant would have had ***NO known*** way to access the federal district "court" if the case had gone forward, as it should have;
12. ***"People" v Henshall Citation No ?????*** in the San Leandro-Hayward Municipal Court (1991) in which Affiant was arrested and cited for multiple "public offenses", including CVC 14601; upon Affiant's timely demand to ascertain the definition of "dollar", for purposes of posting eleven thousand dollars (\$ 11,000.00 !) bail, he was released ***WITHOUT*** posting bail, and ***WITHOUT*** signing any documents and your Affiant has not heard anything

about these charges in 30 years;

13. ***“People” v Henshall Case No. 231195*** in the San Leandro-Hayward Municipal Court 11/22(!)1988, where Affiant was “convicted” of violations of Sections 12500 and 20002 of the CALIFORNIA Vehicle Code, wherein ***ALL*** of the constitutional violations herein at issue arose, were challenged, ***unopposed***, denied, but ***NEVER*** heard in any (appellate) forum; the appeal taken was abandoned by Affiant upon learning there was ***NO RIGHT*** to an appeal in a criminal case (***McKane v Durston 153 US 684***) -- copy of ***RECEIVED*** Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus cheerfully presented upon request;
14. ***Henshall v Valverde et al Case No. 500622*** in the San Mateo County Court, a Petition for Redress of Grievance in the form of Declaratory & Injunctive Relief which was summarily dismissed, jury trial denied and, yet again, with ***NO*** opposition filed against Affiant’s claims;
15. ***Meeks v HMS Host/HERE Case No. CIV 502819***, in the San Mateo County Superior Court, yet another case summarily removed to not only a federal district “court”, but the ***WRONG*** “court” (Oakland, California), assuming arguendo that the case was removable at all, again with nothing more than boilerplate removal pleadings and ***NO OPPOSITION*** (!) to any of the issues arising in this case;
16. ***Lopez v Wachovia Bank Case No. 485814*** in the San Mateo County Superior Court; while this case was not (!) removed, but could easily have been given the current construction of 28 USC 1441 making every case filed in a ‘state court’ removable, this case was given the standard ‘pro per 12(b)(6) treatment’ /aka/ bum’s rush and the ensuing appeal summarily dismissed by the First Appellate District, all of this ***without opposition*** (well duh) and with ***NO*** appearance by Wachovia Bank or any other Defendant;
17. ***“People” v L. Rovai Case No. 40503*** in the San Mateo County Superior Court -- summary denial of Service Agreement, as hereinabove mentioned, ***NO*** response by DA to timely filed Demand for Bill of Particulars, refusal to file Writ of Habeas Corpus, refusal to file, and/or mis-filing of timely Motion to Quash Service of Process, Section 418.10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, ***NO*** injured party, ***NO*** accuser to confront & cross examine, ***NO*** jury trial, ***NO*** assistance of counsel, ***NO*** appeal, ***NO*** Habeas Corpus;

18. ***STATE of OREGON v Cannon*** Citation Nos. **981148, 981149 and 980264** from May 9th, 2012 -- timely Demand for Bill of Particulars filed with District Attorney, cases 'transferred' to Attorney General's Office in Salem, **NO ACTION** taken to date on any cases, inquires to Attorney General **NOT** answered;
19. ***STATE of WASHINGTON v Cannon*** Citation No. **3Z0626835**, another traffic case being a virtual clone to the situation in 18 (above), with Bill of Particulars filed with Prosecuting Attorney and **NO** answer;
20. ***"People" v L. Rovai*** Case Nos. **C203441, C234121, C275505 and 16TRS014743**, in the San Mateo traffic "court", **ALL** cases being summarily dismissed "in the interests of justice" or for a (**willful** ?) failure to appear by the arresting officer (dismissal notices attached, where available);
21. ***"People" v Rovai/Pickett*** Citation No. **RA0382407**, where formal charges were not even filed, after your Affiant contacted SF DA Gascon and clearly indicated that a **BoP** et al would be filed if charges were filed;
22. ***"People" v Pickett-Rose, Case No. 17TR-13106*** in the Merced County traffic "court", a case in which the Accused's **timely** filed challenges to jurisdiction and venue were ignored, with the "court" sending the Accused a blank, unpromulgated 'judicial' council form **"Notice: Receipt of Recent Correspondence"** in which it stated that "your request has been denied" (details stated in Exhibit in Petition/Complaint), with the Accused being **summarily denied any opportunity to be heard and defend**;
23. ***In Re Matter of William Henshall, NO*** Case number ever assigned and Petition for a **NON**-statutory federal Writ of Habeas Corpus summarily denied by a **deputy clerk** (!?) of the court (details stated in Exhibit to Petition/Complaint), which effectively concedes that California is **NOT** a State admitted into "**this Union**" !
24. ***In Re Matter of William Henshall, NO*** Case number ever assigned, a Petition for a Petition for Redress of Grievance summarily denied by Kevin Mullin, on behalf of the CALIFORNIA **ASSEMBLY**, with an **exact** citation to the above dismissal by a **deputy clerk** (!?) of the court, which also effectively concedes that California is **NOT** a State admitted into "**this Union**" !

25. Response to FOIA request by CALIFORNIA Secretary, the office which would 'officially' know, conceding that the *California Constitution of 1849* has **NOT** been repealed, thus California *is and remains, a sovereign, independent State admitted into "this Union"*
24. "*People*" v *Watkins Case No. 19-CR-007916G* in the Alameda County superior court, in which was presented **800 (!)** pages of documents and pleadings challenging jurisdiction, which were **NOT** opposed and with the case c 'settled', as it were with a time served plea deal for **14** charged felonies, the government thus conceding that it could **NOT** go to trial and face your Affiant taking the stand as an *expert witness* on the Constitution, history and laws of the united States;
25. All these cases have other common denominators, such as:
 - a. **NO APPEARANCE** by any real party in interest, a violation of FRCP 17 and/or Section 367 of the CALIFORNIA Code of Civil Procedure, to the extent that either of these might be applicable;
 - b. an "appearance", if it can be called that, by a 'state' Bar member licensed attorney, which presents a **clear & unambiguous bias & prejudice** such is evidenced in the results of the hereinabove mentioned cases, with one Bar Association member appearing before another (a "judge", who in CALIFORNIA cases is **REQUIRED** to be a member of the 'state' **BAR ASS**ociation (Article VI, Section 15 of the bastardized version of the CALIFORNIA Constitution allegedly in effect));
 - c. no presentation of such 'state' Bar member's license to practice law, even when a timely demand, as in *Case No. 683711*, has been made for the same;
 - d. no presentation of such 'state' Bar member's agreement for services to represent the interest(s) of any artificial, corporate entity, and/or scope of authority to act, even when a timely demand, as in *Case No. 683711*, has been made for the same;
 - e. **NO opposition** filed, most especially if solely by alleged counsel for any artificial, corporate entity, by anyone having **personal** knowledge

of whatever purported facts and law were asserted by such licensed member of the 'state' Bar Association

- f. with removal cases, and in particular those in which there is an alleged diversity of citizenship, artificial, corporate entities are **NOT** and cannot be, State Citizens for this purpose, thus any removal should, *res ipsa loquitor*, fail for lack of standing, for if any actions of the *de facto national* government short of a lawfully adopted amendment to the *Constitution for the united States {1787-1791}* in compliance with *Article V* thereof, can effectively dictate to the States ("states" ??) who and/or what is to comprise the makeup of the "state", this effectively *un*-admits a State lawfully admitted into "*this Union*" (*Article IV, Section 3*) and/or effectively reduces, or in some cases merely recognizes, the State involved has been reduced, *for all effective intents and purposes*, to a federal (*insular* ?) territorial possession, and without a shred of Constitutional authority anywhere in sight by which this reduction in status could be accomplished;
- g. denial of the right to trial by jury based on nothing more than pretended poppycock procedural BS "errors";
- h. with a *total* absence of any Plaintiff, not to mention *injured* party, in any of the traffic-'criminal' cases hereinabove mentioned, since all such cases were brought in the name of the "People of the State of California", an entity which does **NOT** exist in the bastardized version of the California Constitution allegedly currently in effect, but *does* exist pursuant to *Article II, Sec. 1* of the *California Constitution (1849)* which the office of Secretary of State has confirmed, *in writing*, has **NOT** been repealed, and see e.g. *Van Valkenburg v Brown 43 Ca. 43*; (proof on request)
- i. in *ALL* cases, with "judges" pretending to preside in judicial courts, but really acting *coram non judice*, in *federal legislative territorial tribunals*, Affiant, and *all like situated* litigants, have been *defrauded* of their rights of redress of grievance, access to judicial power of the united States, trial by jury according to the course of common law, *unlimited* power to contract, protection from Bills of Attainder, and with the destruction of the electoral system in the bargain;


- j. subject to further analysis, it seems likely, to the extent that they might apply, that there are violations of *at least* 18 USC 911, 912 and 1001, and possibly other federal criminal laws as well;
- k. under these circumstances, and with “judges” either falsely claiming to be Citizens of the united States or adhering to a position of “owing” their “citizenship” to Section 1 of the *NON*-existent 14th *war* “amendment”, there is a *palpable irreconcilable conflict of interest* against claimants of membership in the sovereign Body Politic of the Nation & Republic, for when the law of Citizenship becomes restored, all claimants of such ersatz “citizenship” as set forth in the 14th *war* “amendment”, a provision of law which has *never* existed, lose their “citizenship” and cannot be restored, assuming arguendo that they could otherwise become lawful de jure free white State Citizens, such claimants, having *voluntarily* accepted 14th *war* “amendment citizenship” and, *knowingly or otherwise, actively* aided and abetted in acts of treason, and/or adhering to the enemies of the united States, in sustaining the hegemony of the *de facto national socialist* government and it’s concomitant exercise of *unlimited* power pursuant to *federal regional martial law rule* during what has been, for *150* years, a *perpetual* state of some or another pretended “emergency”;

In conclusion, and in concert with a long train of abuses, spanning *4 decades* in the case of Affiant, and similar *known* results of other victims, 12(b)(6) summary dismissals *routinely* occurring to the disfavored class of pesky pro per litigants, the events described herein are far more insidious than the mere “preternatural solicitousness for corporate well-being” decried in the supreme Court of the united States in the case of *Blue Chip Stamps v Manor Drugs* 421 US 723 (Brennan, Blackmun and Douglas, JJ dissenting), and it is high time for the return of the *original intent* of the Framers of the *Constitution for the united States {1787-1791}*.

The only question is if, in the process of restoration of a government of *defined* and *limited* powers, there will occur another Ruby Ridge, Waco, Kent State, Pottawatomie, Wounded Knee, Lusitania, Pearl Harbor, Battleship Maine, Dealey Plaza, 911, or even Tiananmen Square and more “emergencies” to be created by modern day doppelgangers of the likes of Charles Sumner, W. A. Harriman, Allen Dulles, H. L. Stimson and E. M. House type agents behind the *de*

facto national socialist government and await enforcement on future generations of Americans, ***whether or not*** members of the sovereign body politic of the Nation & Republic.

This document was executed in San Mateo, California on the 3rd day of July, 2022.


William Henshall
William Henshall/Affiant
First Judicial District
205 Ramona Street
San Mateo, California, united States
Youwinincourt@gmail.com